

Inversible Max-Plus Algebras and Integrable systems

Tomoshiro OCHIAI

Graduate School of Mathematical Sciences,

The University of Tokyo,

Tokyo 153-8914, Japan

Abstract

We present an extended version of max-plus algebra which includes the inverse operator of “max”. This algebra enables us to ultra-discretize the system including subtractions and obtain new ultra-discrete equations. The known ultra-discrete equations can also be recovered by this construction.

PACS numbers: 02.30.Ik, 02.30.Jr, 05.45.Yv

1. Introduction

An integrable system is one of main subjects in mathematics and physics. Especially, soliton equations and integrable lattice models have been studied as integrable systems in a variety of points of view. Recently, by the development of computer sciences, discrete and ultra-discrete versions of integral system have been attracting a great deal of attention. The ultra-discretization of soliton equations and other various important equations are intensively studied in [1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8]. Moreover, it is known that the various ultra-discrete soliton equations are obtained from solvable vertex model in statistical mechanics in a certain limiting procedure [9, 10]. The key formula for the ultra-discretization is given by

$$\lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow \infty} \epsilon \log(e^{X/\epsilon} + e^{Y/\epsilon}) = \max(X, Y)$$

for arbitrary real numbers X, Y . Using this formula, it is known that the field of real numbers can be transformed into the so-called "max-plus" algebra, which is well known in integrable systems. But the main difficulty for the usual ultra-discretization procedure is that there is no operator corresponding to the subtraction " $-$ ". (see Fig.1) Therefore, so far, we cannot deal with ultra-discretization of integral systems including the subtraction.

In this paper, in order to solve this difficulty, we define an extended version of max-plus algebra called "invertible Max-Plus algebra", which includes the usual max-plus algebra and the operator corresponding to the subtraction.

$$\begin{aligned} x \times y &\longrightarrow X + Y \\ x/y &\longrightarrow X - Y \\ x + y &\longrightarrow \max(X, Y) \\ x - y &\longrightarrow ?? \end{aligned}$$

Fig. 1. ultra-discretization

Our constructions is as follows. We shall define a Max-Plus algebra as $\mathbf{Z}$ -module A with the operation $\text{Max} : A \times A \rightarrow A$ satisfying

$$(\alpha + \beta) + \gamma = \alpha + (\beta + \gamma), \tag{1.1}$$

$$\text{Max}(\text{Max}(\alpha, \beta), \gamma) = \text{Max}(\alpha, \text{Max}(\beta, \gamma)), \tag{1.2}$$

$$\text{Max}(\alpha + \beta, \alpha + \gamma) = \alpha + \text{Max}(\beta, \gamma), \tag{1.3}$$

for $\alpha, \beta, \gamma \in A$. Max-Plus subalgebra and homomorphism are defined in the usual manner. The basic example is $\mathbf{Z}$ which is the ring of integer with $\text{Max}(n, m) = \max(n, m)$, where $\max(n, m)$ stands for the maximum of the pair n and m .

In this paper, we explicitly construct Max-Plus algebra Ω and Ω_0 with $P : \Omega_0 \rightarrow \mathbf{Z}$ such that

- (1) $\Omega \supset \Omega_0$ as Max-Plus algebra,
- (2) $P : \Omega_0 \rightarrow \mathbf{Z}$ as Max-Plus homomorphism,
- (3) There exists an element $\eta \in \Omega$ such that

$$\text{Max}(\text{Max}(\alpha, \beta), \beta + \eta) = \alpha \quad (1.4)$$

for arbitrary $\alpha, \beta \in \Omega$

We call Ω *invertible Max-Plus algebra*, due to the invertible property of Max operator (1.4).

It is known that we can construct UD equation (ultra-discrete equation) on $\mathbf{Z}$ from standard discrete PDE's (partial differential equations) satisfying certain conditions through the usual ultra-discretization procedure. But, using our constructions, we can construct UD equation on Ω from any discrete PDE's, even if they include the subtraction. If this UD equation and its solution on Ω belong to Ω_0 , the projection P gives the UD equation and solutions on $\mathbf{Z}$ explained above. As an application, we apply this invertible Max-Plus algebra Ω to periodic recursive equation and obtain UD periodic equation on Ω and $\mathbf{Z}$.

Acknowledgements. We would like to express our hearty thanks to Professor J.Satsuma for his advice and encouragement.

2. Invertible Max-Plus algebras

2.1. Definition of $\tilde{\mathbf{Z}}$

Let $\mathbf{Z}_2 = \{0, \eta\}$ be the finite group of order two (i.e. $0+0=0$, $0+\eta=\eta$, $\eta+\eta=0$,) and set

$$\tilde{\mathbf{Z}} = \mathbf{Z} \oplus \mathbf{Z}_2 \cup \{-\infty\} = \{x + \xi \mid x \in \mathbf{Z}, \xi \in \mathbf{Z}_2\} \cup \{-\infty\}.$$

Firstly, we shall define “max” operator on $\tilde{\mathbf{Z}}$ (i.e., $\max : \tilde{\mathbf{Z}} \times \tilde{\mathbf{Z}} \rightarrow \tilde{\mathbf{Z}}$) as follows. For $a = x + \xi \in \mathbf{Z} \oplus \mathbf{Z}_2$, $a' = x' + \xi' \in \mathbf{Z} \oplus \mathbf{Z}_2$, set

$$\begin{aligned} \max(a, -\infty) &= a, \\ \max(-\infty, -\infty) &= -\infty, \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\max(a, a') = \begin{cases} a & (x > x'), \\ a & (x = x' \text{ and } \xi = \xi'), \\ a' & (x < x'), \\ -\infty & (x = x' \text{ and } \xi \neq \xi'). \end{cases}$$

Secondly, we shall define “plus” operator on $\tilde{\mathbf{Z}}$ (i.e., $\text{plus} : \tilde{\mathbf{Z}} \times \tilde{\mathbf{Z}} \rightarrow \tilde{\mathbf{Z}}$) as follows. For $a = x + \xi \in \mathbf{Z} \oplus \mathbf{Z}_2$ and $a' = x' + \xi' \in \mathbf{Z} \oplus \mathbf{Z}_2$, set

$$\begin{aligned} \text{plus}(a, a') &= (x + x') + (\xi + \xi'), \\ \text{plus}(a, -\infty) &= -\infty, \\ \text{plus}(-\infty, -\infty) &= -\infty. \end{aligned}$$

In the sequel, we write $a + b$ for $\text{plus}(a, b)$ for the matter of convenience.

If $a \neq a' + \eta$, define the order relations $a > a'$, $a < a'$ and $a = a'$ by

$$\begin{aligned} a > a' &\iff x > x', \\ a < a' &\iff x < x', \\ a = a' &\iff x = x' \text{ and } \xi = \xi'. \end{aligned}$$

If $a \neq \eta$, define the absolute value $|a|$ by

$$|a| = \max(a, 0) + \max(-a, 0).$$

2.2. Definition of Ξ

Set

$$\tilde{\mathbf{Z}}^n = \{(a_1, \dots, a_n) \mid a_1, \dots, a_n \in \tilde{\mathbf{Z}}\}.$$

For the matter of convenience, an element $(a_1, \dots, a_n)$ is denoted by $\mathbf{a}$ or $(a_i)_{i=1}^n$.

Set $\Xi = \bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty} \tilde{\mathbf{Z}}^n / \sim$, where the union is disjoint and the equivalence relation “ $\sim$ ” is generated by

$$(\dots, a_i, \dots, a_j, \dots) \sim (\dots, a_j, \dots, a_i, \dots), \quad (2.1)$$

$$(a_1, \dots, a_n, b, b + \eta) \sim (a_1, \dots, a_n, -\infty), \quad (2.2)$$

$$(a_1, \dots, a_n, -\infty) \sim (a_1, \dots, a_n). \quad (2.3)$$

An element $(a_1, \dots, a_n)$ is called irreducible, if n is minimum in its equivalence class. We remark that we can introduce the order relations into $a_1, \dots, a_n$, if $(a_1, \dots, a_n)$ is irreducible.

If there is no danger of confusion, the equivalence class defined by $(a_1, \dots, a_n)$ is also denoted by $(a_1, \dots, a_n)$.

Let us define "Max" and "Plus" operators on $\Xi = \bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty} \tilde{\mathbf{Z}}^n / \sim$ (i.e., $\overline{\text{Max}} : \Xi \times \Xi \rightarrow \Xi$ and $\text{Plus} : \Xi \times \Xi \rightarrow \Xi$) as follows. For $\mathbf{a} = (a_i)_{i=1}^n = (a_1, \dots, a_n) \in \Xi$ and $\mathbf{b} = (b_i)_{i=1}^m = (b_1, \dots, b_m) \in \Xi$, set

$$\overline{\text{Max}}(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b}) = (a_1, \dots, a_n, b_1, \dots, b_m), \quad (2.4)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Plus}(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b}) &= (a_i + b_j)_{i=1, j=1}^n{}^m \\ &= (a_1 + b_1, \dots, a_n + b_1, a_1 + b_2, \dots, a_n + b_m). \end{aligned} \quad (2.5)$$

In the sequel, we write $\mathbf{a} + \mathbf{b}$ for $\text{Plus}(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b})$ for the matter of convenience.

Lemma 2.1 The above definition is well defined.

Proof. It is enough to show that the definition is invariant under relations (2.1) $\sim$ (2.3).

Firstly, we will show the "Max" operator is invariant under relations (2.1), (2.2) and (2.3). For $\mathbf{a} = (a_1 \dots, a_i, \dots, a_j, \dots, a_n)$, $\mathbf{a}' = (a_1, \dots, a_j, \dots, a_i, \dots, a_n)$ and $\mathbf{b} = (b_1, \dots, b_m)$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \overline{\text{Max}}(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b}) &= (a_1 \dots, a_i, \dots, a_j, \dots, a_n, b_1, \dots, b_m) \\ &= (a_1, \dots, a_j, \dots, a_i, \dots, a_n, b_1, \dots, b_m) \\ &= \overline{\text{Max}}(\mathbf{a}', \mathbf{b}), \end{aligned}$$

which shows the invariance under relation (2.1). For $\mathbf{a} = (a_1 \dots, a_n, c, c+\eta)$, $\mathbf{a}' = (a_1, \dots, a_n, -\infty)$ and $\mathbf{b} = (b_1, \dots, b_m)$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \overline{\text{Max}}(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b}) &= (a_1 \dots, a_n, c, c+\eta, b_1, \dots, b_m) \\ &= (a_1, \dots, a_n, -\infty, b_1, \dots, b_m) \\ &= \overline{\text{Max}}(\mathbf{a}', \mathbf{b}), \end{aligned}$$

which shows the invariance under relation (2.2). For $\mathbf{a} = (a_1 \dots, a_n, -\infty)$, $\mathbf{a}' = (a_1, \dots, a_n)$ and $\mathbf{b} = (b_1, \dots, b_m)$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \overline{\text{Max}}(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b}) &= (a_1 \dots, a_n, -\infty, b_1, \dots, b_m) \\ &= (a_1, \dots, a_n, b_1, \dots, b_m) \\ &= \overline{\text{Max}}(\mathbf{a}', \mathbf{b}), \end{aligned}$$

which shows the invariance under relation (2.3).

Secondly, we will show the “Plus” operator is invariant under relation (2.1), (2.2) and (2.3). For $\mathbf{a} = (a_1 \cdots, a_i, \cdots, a_j, \cdots, a_n)$, $\mathbf{a}' = (a_1, \cdots, a_j, \cdots, a_i, \cdots, a_n)$ and $\mathbf{b} = (b_1, \cdots, b_m)$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{a} + \mathbf{b} &= (a_1 + b_k, \cdots, a_i + b_k, \cdots, a_j + b_k, \cdots, a_n + b_k)_{k=1}^m \\ &= (a_1 + b_k, \cdots, a_j + b_k, \cdots, a_i + b_k, \cdots, a_n + b_k)_{k=1}^m \\ &= \mathbf{a}' + \mathbf{b}, \end{aligned}$$

which shows the invariance under relation (2.1). For $\mathbf{a} = (a_1 \cdots, a_n, c, c+\eta)$, $\mathbf{a}' = (a_1, \cdots, a_n, -\infty)$ and $\mathbf{b} = (b_1, \cdots, b_m)$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{a} + \mathbf{b} &= (a_1 + b_k, \cdots, a_n + b_k, c + b_k, c + \eta + b_k)_{k=1}^m \\ &= (a_1 + b_k, \cdots, a_n + b_k, -\infty + b_k)_{k=1}^m \\ &= \mathbf{a}' + \mathbf{b}, \end{aligned}$$

which shows the invariance under relation (2.2). For $\mathbf{a} = (a_1 \cdots, a_n, -\infty)$, $\mathbf{a}' = (a_1, \cdots, a_n)$ and $\mathbf{b} = (b_1, \cdots, b_m)$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{a} + \mathbf{b} &= (a_1 + b_k, \cdots, a_n + b_k, -\infty + b_k)_{k=1}^m \\ &= (a_1 + b_k, \cdots, a_n + b_k)_{k=1}^m \\ &= \mathbf{a}' + \mathbf{b}, \end{aligned}$$

which shows the invariance under relation (2.3). $\square$

Lemma 2.2 For $\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b}, \mathbf{c} \in \Xi$, we have the following identities:

$$(\mathbf{a} + \mathbf{b}) + \mathbf{c} = \mathbf{a} + (\mathbf{b} + \mathbf{c}), \quad (2.6)$$

$$\overline{\text{Max}}(\overline{\text{Max}}(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b}), \mathbf{c}) = \overline{\text{Max}}(\mathbf{a}, \overline{\text{Max}}(\mathbf{b}, \mathbf{c})), \quad (2.7)$$

$$\overline{\text{Max}}(\mathbf{a} + \mathbf{b}, \mathbf{a} + \mathbf{c}) = \mathbf{a} + \overline{\text{Max}}(\mathbf{b}, \mathbf{c}), \quad (2.8)$$

$$\overline{\text{Max}}(\overline{\text{Max}}(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b}), \mathbf{b} + \eta) = \mathbf{a}. \quad (2.9)$$

Proof. Suppose $\mathbf{a} = (a_1, \cdots, a_n)$, $\mathbf{b} = (b_1, \cdots, b_m)$ and $\mathbf{c} = (c_1, \cdots, c_l)$. The proof is straightforward from (2.4) and (2.5). First formula (2.6) is obtained by the following computation:

$$(\mathbf{a} + \mathbf{b}) + \mathbf{c} = (a_i + b_j + c_k)_{i=1, j=1, k=1}^{n, m, l} = \mathbf{a} + (\mathbf{b} + \mathbf{c}).$$

Second formula (2.7) is obtained by the following computation:

$$\overline{\text{Max}}(\overline{\text{Max}}(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b}), \mathbf{c}) = (a_1 \cdots, a_n, b_1, \cdots, b_m, c_1, \cdots, c_l) = \overline{\text{Max}}(\mathbf{a}, \overline{\text{Max}}(\mathbf{b}, \mathbf{c})).$$

Third formula (2.8) is obtained by the following computation:

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbf{a} + \overline{\text{Max}}(\mathbf{b}, \mathbf{c}) &= \mathbf{a} + (b_1, \dots, b_m, c_1, \dots, c_l) \\
&= (b_1 + a_i, \dots, b_m + a_i, c_1 + a_i, \dots, c_l + a_i)_{i=1}^n \\
&= \overline{\text{Max}}((b_1 + a_i, \dots, b_m + a_i)_{i=1}^n, (c_1 + a_i, \dots, c_l + a_i)_{i=1}^n) \\
&= \overline{\text{Max}}(\mathbf{a} + \mathbf{b}, \mathbf{a} + \mathbf{c}).
\end{aligned}$$

Last formula (2.9) is obtained by the following computation:

$$\begin{aligned}
\overline{\text{Max}}(\overline{\text{Max}}(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b}), \mathbf{b} + \eta) &= (a_1 \dots, a_n, b_1, \dots, b_m, b_1 + \eta, \dots, b_m + \eta) \\
&= (a_1 \dots, a_n) \\
&= \mathbf{a}.
\end{aligned}$$

□

2.3. Definition of Φ

Set $\Phi = \Xi \times \Xi' / \sim$, where $\Xi' = \Xi \setminus \{(-\infty)\}$ and the equivalence relation is given by

$$(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b}) \sim (\mathbf{a}', \mathbf{b}') \iff \mathbf{a} + \mathbf{b}' = \mathbf{a}' + \mathbf{b}, \quad (2.10)$$

for $(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b}), (\mathbf{a}', \mathbf{b}') \in \Xi \times \Xi'$. The equivalence class of $(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b})$ is denoted by $\mathbf{a} - \mathbf{b}$. Then, we have

$$\Phi = \{\mathbf{a} - \mathbf{b} \mid \mathbf{a} \in \Xi, \mathbf{b} \in \Xi'\}.$$

Next, we will define "Max", "Plus" and "Minus" operators on Φ (i.e., $\text{Max} : \Phi \times \Phi \rightarrow \Phi$, $\text{Plus} : \Phi \times \Phi \rightarrow \Phi$ and $\text{Minus} : \Phi \times \Phi \rightarrow \Phi$) as follows. For $\alpha = \mathbf{a} - \mathbf{b} \in \Phi$ and $\alpha' = \mathbf{a}' - \mathbf{b}' \in \Phi$, set

$$\text{Max}(\alpha, \alpha') = \overline{\text{Max}}(\mathbf{a} + \mathbf{b}', \mathbf{a}' + \mathbf{b}) - (\mathbf{b} + \mathbf{b}'), \quad (2.11)$$

$$\text{Plus}(\alpha, \alpha') = (\mathbf{a} + \mathbf{a}') - (\mathbf{b} + \mathbf{b}'), \quad (2.12)$$

$$\text{Minus}(\alpha, \alpha') = (\mathbf{a} + \mathbf{b}') - (\mathbf{b} + \mathbf{a}'). \quad (2.13)$$

In the sequel, for the matter of convenience, we write $\alpha + \alpha'$ and $\alpha - \alpha'$ for $\text{Plus}(\alpha, \alpha')$ and $\text{Minus}(\alpha, \alpha')$ respectively.

Lemma 2.3 The above definition is well defined.

Proof. Firstly, we will show the “Max” operator is invariant under relations (2.10). For $\mathbf{a} - \mathbf{b} = \mathbf{a}' - \mathbf{b}' \in \Phi$ and $\mathbf{c} - \mathbf{d} \in \Phi$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\text{Max}(\mathbf{a} - \mathbf{b}, \mathbf{c} - \mathbf{d}) &= \overline{\text{Max}}(\mathbf{a} + \mathbf{d}, \mathbf{c} + \mathbf{b}) - (\mathbf{b} + \mathbf{d}) \\
&= \overline{\text{Max}}(\mathbf{a} + \mathbf{b}' + \mathbf{d}, \mathbf{c} + \mathbf{b} + \mathbf{b}') - (\mathbf{b} + \mathbf{b}' + \mathbf{d}) \\
&= \overline{\text{Max}}(\mathbf{a}' + \mathbf{b} + \mathbf{d}, \mathbf{c} + \mathbf{b} + \mathbf{b}') - (\mathbf{b} + \mathbf{b}' + \mathbf{d}) \\
&= \overline{\text{Max}}(\mathbf{a}' + \mathbf{d}, \mathbf{c} + \mathbf{b}') - (\mathbf{b}' + \mathbf{d}) \\
&= \text{Max}(\mathbf{a}' - \mathbf{b}', \mathbf{c} - \mathbf{d}),
\end{aligned}$$

which shows the invariance under relation (2.10).

Secondly, we will show the “Plus” operator is invariant under relations (2.10). For $\mathbf{a} - \mathbf{b} = \mathbf{a}' - \mathbf{b}' \in \Phi$ and $\mathbf{c} - \mathbf{d} \in \Phi$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
(\mathbf{a} - \mathbf{b}) + (\mathbf{c} - \mathbf{d}) &= (\mathbf{a} + \mathbf{c}) - (\mathbf{b} + \mathbf{d}) \\
&= (\mathbf{a} + \mathbf{b}' + \mathbf{c}) - (\mathbf{b} + \mathbf{b}' + \mathbf{d}) \\
&= (\mathbf{a}' + \mathbf{b} + \mathbf{c}) - (\mathbf{b} + \mathbf{b}' + \mathbf{d}) \\
&= (\mathbf{a}' + \mathbf{c}) - (\mathbf{b}' + \mathbf{d}) \\
&= (\mathbf{a}' - \mathbf{b}') + (\mathbf{c} - \mathbf{d}),
\end{aligned}$$

which shows the invariance under relation (2.10).

Thirdly, we will show the “Minus” operator is invariant under relations (2.10). For $\mathbf{a} - \mathbf{b} = \mathbf{a}' - \mathbf{b}' \in \Phi$ and $\mathbf{c} - \mathbf{d} \in \Phi$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
(\mathbf{a} - \mathbf{b}) - (\mathbf{c} - \mathbf{d}) &= (\mathbf{a} + \mathbf{d}) - (\mathbf{b} + \mathbf{c}) \\
&= (\mathbf{a} + \mathbf{b}' + \mathbf{d}) - (\mathbf{b} + \mathbf{b}' + \mathbf{c}) \\
&= (\mathbf{a}' + \mathbf{b} + \mathbf{d}) - (\mathbf{b} + \mathbf{b}' + \mathbf{c}) \\
&= (\mathbf{a}' + \mathbf{d}) - (\mathbf{b}' + \mathbf{c}) \\
&= (\mathbf{a}' - \mathbf{b}') - (\mathbf{c} - \mathbf{d}),
\end{aligned}$$

which shows the invariance under relation (2.10). $\square$

Next, we shall show that Φ has the Max-Plus algebra structures (1.1), (1.2), (1.3) and the inversible property (1.4). More precisely, we have the following lemma.

Lemma 2.4 For $\alpha, \beta, \gamma \in \Phi$, we have the following identities:

$$(\alpha + \beta) + \gamma = \alpha + (\beta + \gamma), \tag{2.14}$$

$$\text{Max}(\text{Max}(\alpha, \beta), \gamma) = \text{Max}(\alpha, \text{Max}(\beta, \gamma)), \quad (2.15)$$

$$\text{Max}(\alpha + \beta, \alpha + \gamma) = \alpha + \text{Max}(\beta, \gamma), \quad (2.16)$$

$$\text{Max}(\text{Max}(\alpha, \beta), \beta + \eta) = \alpha. \quad (2.17)$$

Proof. Suppose $\alpha = \mathbf{a} - \mathbf{b}$, $\beta = \mathbf{c} - \mathbf{d}$ and $\gamma = \mathbf{e} - \mathbf{f}$. First identity (2.14) is obtained by the following computation:

$$\begin{aligned} (\alpha + \beta) + \gamma &= (\mathbf{a} + \mathbf{c} + \mathbf{e}) - (\mathbf{b} + \mathbf{d} + \mathbf{f}) \\ &= \alpha + (\beta + \gamma). \end{aligned}$$

Second identity (2.15) is obtained by the following computation:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Max}(\text{Max}(\alpha, \beta), \gamma) &= \text{Max}(\text{Max}(\mathbf{a} - \mathbf{b}, \mathbf{c} - \mathbf{d}), \mathbf{e} - \mathbf{f}) \\ &= \text{Max}(\overline{\text{Max}}(\mathbf{a} + \mathbf{d}, \mathbf{c} + \mathbf{b}) - (\mathbf{b} + \mathbf{d}), \mathbf{e} - \mathbf{f}) \\ &= \overline{\text{Max}}(\overline{\text{Max}}(\mathbf{a} + \mathbf{d}, \mathbf{c} + \mathbf{b}) + \mathbf{f}, \mathbf{e} + \mathbf{b} + \mathbf{d}) - (\mathbf{b} + \mathbf{d} + \mathbf{f}) \\ &= \overline{\text{Max}}(\overline{\text{Max}}(\mathbf{a} + \mathbf{d} + \mathbf{f}, \mathbf{c} + \mathbf{b} + \mathbf{f}), \mathbf{e} + \mathbf{b} + \mathbf{d}) - (\mathbf{b} + \mathbf{d} + \mathbf{f}) \\ &= \overline{\text{Max}}(\mathbf{a} + \mathbf{d} + \mathbf{f}, \overline{\text{Max}}(\mathbf{c} + \mathbf{b} + \mathbf{f}, \mathbf{e} + \mathbf{b} + \mathbf{d})) - (\mathbf{b} + \mathbf{d} + \mathbf{f}) \\ &= \overline{\text{Max}}(\mathbf{a} + \mathbf{d} + \mathbf{f}, \overline{\text{Max}}(\mathbf{c} + \mathbf{f}, \mathbf{e} + \mathbf{d}) + \mathbf{b}) - (\mathbf{b} + \mathbf{d} + \mathbf{f}) \\ &= \text{Max}(\mathbf{a} - \mathbf{b}, \overline{\text{Max}}(\mathbf{c} + \mathbf{f}, \mathbf{e} + \mathbf{d}) - (\mathbf{d} + \mathbf{f})) \\ &= \text{Max}(\mathbf{a} - \mathbf{b}, \text{Max}(\mathbf{c} - \mathbf{d}, \mathbf{e} - \mathbf{f})) \\ &= \text{Max}(\alpha, \text{Max}(\beta, \gamma)). \end{aligned}$$

Third identity (2.16) is obtained by the following computation:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Max}(\alpha + \beta, \alpha + \gamma) &= \text{Max}((\mathbf{a} - \mathbf{b}) + (\mathbf{c} - \mathbf{d}), (\mathbf{a} - \mathbf{b}) + (\mathbf{e} - \mathbf{f})) \\ &= \text{Max}((\mathbf{a} + \mathbf{c}) - (\mathbf{b} + \mathbf{d}), (\mathbf{a} + \mathbf{e}) - (\mathbf{b} + \mathbf{f})) \\ &= \overline{\text{Max}}((\mathbf{a} + \mathbf{c}) + (\mathbf{b} + \mathbf{f}), (\mathbf{a} + \mathbf{e}) + (\mathbf{b} + \mathbf{d})) - (\mathbf{b} + \mathbf{d} + \mathbf{b} + \mathbf{f}) \\ &= \mathbf{a} - \mathbf{b} + \overline{\text{Max}}(\mathbf{c} + \mathbf{f}, \mathbf{e} + \mathbf{d}) - (\mathbf{d} + \mathbf{f}) \\ &= \mathbf{a} - \mathbf{b} + \text{Max}(\mathbf{c} - \mathbf{d}, \mathbf{e} - \mathbf{f}) \\ &= \alpha + \text{Max}(\beta, \gamma). \end{aligned}$$

Final identity (2.17) is obtained by the following computation:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Max}(\text{Max}(\alpha, \beta), \beta + \eta) &= \text{Max}(\text{Max}(\mathbf{a} - \mathbf{b}, \mathbf{c} - \mathbf{d}), \mathbf{c} - \mathbf{d} + \eta) \\ &= \text{Max}(\overline{\text{Max}}(\mathbf{a} + \mathbf{d}, \mathbf{c} + \mathbf{b}) - (\mathbf{b} + \mathbf{d}), \mathbf{c} + \eta - \mathbf{d}) \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= \overline{\text{Max}}(\overline{\text{Max}}(\mathbf{a} + \mathbf{d}, \mathbf{c} + \mathbf{b}) + \mathbf{d}, \mathbf{c} + \eta + \mathbf{b} + \mathbf{d}) - (\mathbf{b} + \mathbf{d} + \mathbf{d}) \\
&= \overline{\text{Max}}(\overline{\text{Max}}(\mathbf{a} + \mathbf{d} + \mathbf{d}, \mathbf{c} + \mathbf{b} + \mathbf{d}), \mathbf{c} + \mathbf{b} + \mathbf{d} + \eta) - (\mathbf{b} + \mathbf{d} + \mathbf{d}) \\
&= \mathbf{a} + \mathbf{d} + \mathbf{d} - (\mathbf{b} + \mathbf{d} + \mathbf{d}) \\
&= \mathbf{a} - \mathbf{b} \\
&= \alpha.
\end{aligned}$$

□

2.4. Definition of inversible Max-Plus algebra Ω

For the matter of convenience, a one-component element $\mathbf{a} = (a) \in \Phi$ is denoted by a , and $\mathbf{b} = (0, -b_1, \dots, -b_n) \in \Phi$ is denoted by $[b_1, \dots, b_n]$, if there is no danger of confusion.

Lemma 2.5 We have

$$[a_1, \dots, a_n] + [b_1, \dots, b_n] = [\{a_i\}_{i=1}^n, \{b_i\}_{i=1}^m, \{a_i + b_j\}_{i=1}^n \{j=1\}^m].$$

Proof. The computation is straightforward as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
[a_1, \dots, a_n] + [b_1, \dots, b_n] &= (0, -a_1, \dots, -a_n) + (0, -b_1, \dots, -b_n) \\
&= (0, \{-a_i\}_{i=1}^n, \{-b_i\}_{i=1}^m, \{-a_i - b_j\}_{i=1}^n \{j=1\}^m) \\
&= [\{a_i\}_{i=1}^n, \{b_i\}_{i=1}^m, \{a_i + b_j\}_{i=1}^n \{j=1\}^m].
\end{aligned}$$

□

Define a subset Ω of Φ by

$$\Omega = \{a + [b_1, \dots, b_n] - [c_1, \dots, c_m] \mid n, m \in \mathbf{N}, a \in \tilde{\mathbf{Z}}, b_i \in \tilde{\mathbf{Z}}_+, c_i \in \tilde{\mathbf{Z}}_+\}, \quad (2.18)$$

where

$$\tilde{\mathbf{Z}}_+ = \{x \in \mathbf{Z} \mid x \geq 0\} \cup \{x + \eta \in \mathbf{Z} \oplus \mathbf{Z}_2 \mid x > 0\}.$$

For $a + [b_1, \dots, b_n] - [c_1, \dots, c_m] \in \Omega$, we call “ a ” a *leading term* and “ $[b_1, \dots, b_n] - [c_1, \dots, c_m]$ ” a *correction term*.

Lemma 2.6 We have

$$\Omega = \Phi.$$

Remark. Ω also has the Max-Plus algebra structures (1.1), (1.2), (1.3) and the inversible property (1.4), because of Lemma 2.4.

Proof. By definition, it is clear that $\Omega \subset \Phi$. Therefore, it is enough to show that $\Phi \subset \Omega$. For $\alpha = (a_1, \dots, a_n) - (b_1, \dots, b_m) \in \Phi$, we may assume that $(a_1, \dots, a_n)$ and $(b_1, \dots, b_m)$ are irreducible and $a_1 \geq \dots \geq a_n$ and $b_1 \geq \dots \geq b_m$, without loss of generality. Then, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & (a_1, \dots, a_n) - (b_1, \dots, b_m) \\ &= a_1 - b_1 + (0, -(a_1 - a_2), \dots, -(a_1 - a_n)) - (0, -(b_1 - b_2), \dots, -(b_1 - b_m)) \\ &= a_1 - b_1 + [(a_1 - a_2), \dots, (a_1 - a_n)] - [(b_1 - b_2), \dots, (b_1 - b_m)] \in \Omega. \end{aligned}$$

Here, we have used $(a_1 - a_i) \in \tilde{\mathbf{Z}}_+$ ($i = 2, \dots, n$) and $(b_1 - b_i) \in \tilde{\mathbf{Z}}_+$ ($i = 2, \dots, m$). $\square$

Next, in the following two theorems, we shall express Plus, Minus and Max operators in Ω .

Theorem 2.7 For $\alpha = a + [b_1, \dots, b_n] - [c_1, \dots, c_m] \in \Omega$ and $\alpha' = a' + [b'_1, \dots, b'_p] - [c'_1, \dots, c'_q] \in \Omega$, the result of the computation of Plus and Minus operators is given by

$$\alpha + \alpha' = a + a' + C_+(\alpha, \alpha'), \quad (2.19)$$

$$\alpha - \alpha' = a - a' + C_-(\alpha, \alpha'), \quad (2.20)$$

where the correction terms C_+, C_- are given by

$$\begin{aligned} C_+(\alpha, \alpha') &= [\{b_i\}_{i=1}^n, \{b'_i\}_{i=1}^p, \{b_i + b'_j\}_{i=1, j=1}^{n, p}] - [\{c_i\}_{i=1}^m, \{c'_i\}_{i=1}^q, \{c_i + c'_j\}_{i=1, j=1}^{m, q}], \\ C_-(\alpha, \alpha') &= [\{b_i\}_{i=1}^n, \{c'_i\}_{i=1}^q, \{b_i + c'_j\}_{i=1, j=1}^{n, q}] - [\{c_i\}_{i=1}^m, \{b'_i\}_{i=1}^p, \{c_i + b'_j\}_{i=1, j=1}^{m, p}]. \end{aligned}$$

Proof. The computation is straightforward from Lemma 2.5. $\square$

Next, we express Max operator in Ω . For arbitrary $\alpha = a + [b_1, \dots, b_n] \in \Omega$ and $\alpha' = a' + [b'_1, \dots, b'_m] \in \Omega$ with irreducible expressions (i.e. $[b_1, \dots, b_n]$ and $[b'_1, \dots, b'_m]$ are irreducible), we may assume that $b_1 \leq \dots \leq b_n$ and $b'_1 \leq \dots \leq b'_m$, without loss of generality. Then, we have the following theorem.

Theorem 2.8 (1) For $\alpha = a + [b_1, \dots, b_n] \in \Omega$ and $\alpha' = a' + [b'_1, \dots, b'_m] \in \Omega$ with $b_1 \leq \dots \leq b_n$ and $b'_1 \leq \dots \leq b'_m$, the expression of $\text{Max}(\alpha, \alpha')$ is given as follows.

If $a \neq a' + \eta$, we have

$$\text{Max}(\alpha, \alpha') = \max(a, a') + C_m(\alpha, \alpha'), \quad (2.21)$$

where the correction term C_m is given by

$$C_m(\alpha, \alpha') = [|a - a'|, \{b_i + \max(a' - a, 0)\}_{i=1}^n, \{b'_i + \max(a - a', 0)\}_{i=1}^m].$$

If $a = a' + \eta$, we have

$$\text{Max}(\alpha, \alpha') = \begin{cases} a - b_{k+1} + [\{b_i - b_{k+1}\}_{i=k+2}^n, \{b'_i - b_{k+1} + \eta\}_{i=k+1}^m] \\ \quad \text{if } \exists k < n, m \text{ s.t. } b_i = b'_i \ (1 \leq i \leq k) \text{ and } b_{k+1} < b'_{k+1}, \\ a - b_{m+1} + [\{b_i - b_{m+1}\}_{i=m+2}^n] \\ \quad \text{if } b_i = b'_i \text{ for } 1 \leq i \leq m < n, \\ h - \infty \\ \quad \text{if } b_i = b'_i \text{ for } 1 \leq i \leq m = n. \end{cases} \quad (2.22)$$

Remark 1. We will extend the above formula for general cases as follows. For

$$\begin{aligned} \alpha &= a + [b_1, \dots, b_n] - [c_1, \dots, c_m] \in \Omega, \\ \alpha' &= a' + [b'_1, \dots, b'_p] - [c'_1, \dots, c'_q] \in \Omega, \end{aligned}$$

the expression of $\text{Max}(\alpha, \alpha')$ can be computed by using (2.21), (2.22) and the identity

$$\text{Max}(\alpha, \alpha') = \text{Max}(a + [b] + [c'], a' + [b'] + [c]) - ([c] + [c']). \quad (2.23)$$

Here, notice that the first term in the right hand side (2.23) can be computed by (2.21), (2.22).

Remark 2. In (2.22), for $[b_1, \dots, b_n]$ and $[b'_1, \dots, b'_m]$, we can assume that there are only the following three cases:

1. There exists $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and $k < n, m$ such that $b_i = b'_i$ ($i = 1, \dots, k$) and $b_{k+1} < b'_{k+1}$,
2. $m < n$ and $b_i = b'_i$ ($i = 1, \dots, m$),
3. $m = n$ and $b_i = b'_i$ ($i = 1, \dots, m$),

without loss of generality. These three cases 1, 2 and 3 correspond to the first, second and third cases in (2.22) respectively.

Proof of Theorem 2.8. Let us consider the case $a \neq a' + \eta$. Without loss of generality, we can assume that $a \geq a'$. Then, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Max}(\alpha, \alpha') &= \text{Max}((a, a - b_1, \dots, a - b_n), (a', a' - b'_1, \dots, a' - b'_m)) \\ &= (a, a - b_1, \dots, a - b_n, a', a' - b'_1, \dots, a' - b'_m) \\ &= a + (0, -b_1, \dots, -b_n, -(a - a'), -(b'_1 + a - a'), \dots, -(b'_m + a - a')) \\ &= a + [a - a', b_1, \dots, b_n, b'_1 + a - a', \dots, b'_m + a - a'], \end{aligned}$$

which shows that (2.21) holds for $a \geq a'$. We can prove (2.21) for the other case $a < a'$ in the same way.

Next, let us consider the case $a = a' + \eta$. Firstly, we consider the first case in (2.22). (i.e. There exists $k \in \mathbf{N}$ and $k < n, m$ such that $b_i = b'_i$ ($i = 1, \dots, k$) and $b_{k+1} < b'_{k+1}$.) In this case, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& \text{Max}(\alpha, \alpha') \\
&= (a, a - b_1, \dots, a - b_n, a', a' - b'_1, \dots, a' - b'_m) \\
&= (a - b_{k+1}, \dots, a - b_n, a' - b'_{k+1}, \dots, a' - b'_m) \\
&= a - b_{k+1} + (0, -(b_{k+2} - b_{k+1}), \dots, -(b_n - b_{k+1}), -(b'_{k+1} - b_{k+1} + \eta), \dots, -(b'_m - b_{k+1} + \eta)) \\
&= a - b_{k+1} + [\{b_i - b_{k+1}\}_{i=k+2}^n, \{b'_i - b_{k+1} + \eta\}_{i=k+1}^m],
\end{aligned}$$

which shows the first case in (2.22). Secondly, we consider the second case in (2.22). (i.e. $m < n$ and $b_i = b'_i$ ($i = 1, \dots, m$)). In this case, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\text{Max}(\alpha, \alpha') &= (a, a - b_1, \dots, a - b_n, a', a' - b'_1, \dots, a' - b'_m) \\
&= (a - b_{m+1}, \dots, a - b_n) \\
&= a - b_{m+1} + (0, -(b_{m+2} - b_{m+1}), \dots, -(b_n - b_{m+1})) \\
&= a - b_{m+1} + [\{b_i - b_{m+1}\}_{i=m+2}^n],
\end{aligned}$$

which shows the second case in (2.22). Thirdly, we consider the third case in (2.22). (i.e. $m = n$ and $b_i = b'_i$ ($i = 1, \dots, m$)). In this case, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\text{Max}(\alpha, \alpha') &= (a, a - b_1, \dots, a - b_n, a', a' - b'_1, \dots, a' - b'_n) \\
&= -\infty,
\end{aligned}$$

which shows the third case in (2.22). $\square$

3. Applications

3.1. The projection to the usual max-plus algebra $\mathbf{Z}$

Let Ω_0 be a subset of Ω defined by $\Omega_0 = \{a + [b_1, \dots, b_n] - [c_1, \dots, c_m] \in \Omega \mid a \in \mathbf{Z}\} \subset \Omega$. For $\alpha = a + [b_1, \dots, b_n] - [c_1, \dots, c_m] \in \Omega_0$, define a projection map $P : \Omega_0 \rightarrow \mathbf{Z}$ by

$$P(\alpha) = a. \quad (3.1)$$

Lemma 3.1 Ω_0 is Max-Plus subalgebra.

Proof. It is clear from (2.21), (2.19) and (2.20). Notice that $a, a' \in \mathbf{Z}$.

Theorem 3.2 The map $P : \Omega_0 \rightarrow \mathbf{Z}$ is a homomorphism map with respect to “Max”, “Plus”, “Minus” operators. More precisely, for $\alpha = a + [b_1, \dots, b_n] - [c_1, \dots, c_m] \in \Omega_0$ and $\alpha' = a' + [b'_1, \dots, b'_p] - [c'_1, \dots, c'_q] \in \Omega_0$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} P(\text{Max}(\alpha, \alpha')) &= \max(a, a'), \\ P(\alpha + \alpha') &= a + a', \\ P(\alpha - \alpha') &= a - a'. \end{aligned}$$

Proof. It is clear from (2.21), (2.19) and (2.20). Notice that $a, a' \in \mathbf{Z}$.

3.2. The faithful representation on Ω

For any positive real number ϵ and $a = x + \xi \in \tilde{\mathbf{Z}}$, set $\bar{a} = x + \bar{\xi} \in \mathbf{C}$, where

$$\bar{\xi} = \begin{cases} i\pi\epsilon & (\xi = \eta), \\ 0 & (\xi = 0). \end{cases}$$

For $\alpha = (a_i)_{i=1}^n - (b_i)_{i=1}^m = (a_1, \dots, a_n) - (b_1, \dots, b_m) \in \Phi$, define a map $R_\epsilon : \Phi \rightarrow \mathbf{C}$ by

$$\begin{aligned} R_\epsilon(\alpha) &= \epsilon \log\left(\sum_i e^{\bar{a}_i/\epsilon}\right) - \epsilon \log\left(\sum_i e^{\bar{b}_i/\epsilon}\right) \\ &= \epsilon \log(e^{\bar{a}_1/\epsilon} + \dots + e^{\bar{a}_n/\epsilon}) - \epsilon \log(e^{\bar{b}_1/\epsilon} + \dots + e^{\bar{b}_m/\epsilon}). \end{aligned}$$

Here we set $e^{\bar{a}_i/\epsilon}$ to be zero, if $a_i = -\infty$.

Lemma 3.3 The above definition $R_\epsilon : \Phi \rightarrow \mathbf{C}$ is well defined.

Proof. Firstly, we shall show that the definition is invariant under relations (2.1), (2.2) and (2.3). For $\mathbf{a} = (a_1, \dots, a_i, \dots, a_j, \dots, a_n)$, $\mathbf{a}' = (a_1, \dots, a_j, \dots, a_i, \dots, a_n)$ and $\mathbf{b} = (b_1, \dots, b_m)$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} R_\epsilon(\mathbf{a} - \mathbf{b}) &= R_\epsilon((a_1, \dots, a_i, \dots, a_j, \dots, a_n) - (b_1, \dots, b_m)) \\ &= \epsilon \log(e^{\bar{a}_1/\epsilon} + \dots + e^{\bar{a}_i/\epsilon} + \dots + e^{\bar{a}_j/\epsilon} + \dots + e^{\bar{a}_n/\epsilon}) - \epsilon \log(e^{\bar{b}_1/\epsilon} + \dots + e^{\bar{b}_m/\epsilon}) \\ &= \epsilon \log(e^{\bar{a}_1/\epsilon} + \dots + e^{\bar{a}_j/\epsilon} + \dots + e^{\bar{a}_i/\epsilon} + \dots + e^{\bar{a}_n/\epsilon}) - \epsilon \log(e^{\bar{b}_1/\epsilon} + \dots + e^{\bar{b}_m/\epsilon}) \\ &= R_\epsilon((a_1, \dots, a_j, \dots, a_i, \dots, a_n) - (b_1, \dots, b_m)) \\ &= R_\epsilon(\mathbf{a}' - \mathbf{b}), \end{aligned}$$

which shows the invariance under relation (2.1). For $\mathbf{a} = (a_1, \dots, a_n, c, c+\eta)$, $\mathbf{a}' = (a_1, \dots, a_n, -\infty)$ and $\mathbf{b} = (b_1, \dots, b_m)$, we have

$$R_\epsilon(\mathbf{a} - \mathbf{b}) = R_\epsilon((a_1, \dots, a_n, c, c+\eta) - (b_1, \dots, b_m))$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= \epsilon \log(e^{\overline{a_1}/\epsilon} + \dots + e^{\overline{a_n}/\epsilon} + e^{\overline{c}/\epsilon} + e^{\overline{c+\eta}/\epsilon}) - \epsilon \log(e^{\overline{b_1}/\epsilon} + \dots + e^{\overline{b_m}/\epsilon}) \\
&= \epsilon \log(e^{\overline{a_1}/\epsilon} + \dots + e^{\overline{a_n}/\epsilon} + e^{\overline{c}/\epsilon} + e^{\overline{c}/\epsilon + i\pi}) - \epsilon \log(e^{\overline{b_1}/\epsilon} + \dots + e^{\overline{b_m}/\epsilon}) \\
&= \epsilon \log(e^{\overline{a_1}/\epsilon} + \dots + e^{\overline{a_n}/\epsilon} + e^{\overline{c}/\epsilon} - e^{\overline{c}/\epsilon}) - \epsilon \log(e^{\overline{b_1}/\epsilon} + \dots + e^{\overline{b_m}/\epsilon}) \\
&= \epsilon \log(e^{\overline{a_1}/\epsilon} + \dots + e^{\overline{a_n}/\epsilon}) - \epsilon \log(e^{\overline{b_1}/\epsilon} + \dots + e^{\overline{b_m}/\epsilon}) \\
&= R_\epsilon(\mathbf{a}' - \mathbf{b}),
\end{aligned}$$

which shows the invariance under relation (2.2). For $\mathbf{a} = (a_1, \dots, a_n, -\infty)$, $\mathbf{a}' = (a_1, \dots, a_n)$ and $\mathbf{b} = (b_1, \dots, b_m)$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
R_\epsilon(\mathbf{a} - \mathbf{b}) &= R_\epsilon((a_1, \dots, a_n, -\infty) - (b_1, \dots, b_m)) \\
&= \epsilon \log(e^{\overline{a_1}/\epsilon} + \dots + e^{\overline{a_n}/\epsilon}) - \epsilon \log(e^{\overline{b_1}/\epsilon} + \dots + e^{\overline{b_m}/\epsilon}) \\
&= R_\epsilon(\mathbf{a}' - \mathbf{b}),
\end{aligned}$$

which shows the invariance under relation (2.3).

Secondly, we shall show that the definition is invariant under relation (2.10). Suppose $(a_1, \dots, a_n) - (b_1, \dots, b_m) = (a'_1, \dots, a'_p) - (b'_1, \dots, b'_q)$. Then we have

$$(a_i + b'_j)_{i=1}^n {}_{j=1}^q = (a'_i + b_j)_{i=1}^p {}_{j=1}^m.$$

Then, it follows that

$$\epsilon \log\left(\sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^q e^{\overline{a_i + b'_j}/\epsilon}\right) = \epsilon \log\left(\sum_{i=1}^p \sum_{j=1}^m e^{\overline{a'_i + b_j}/\epsilon}\right). \quad (3.2)$$

Then, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&R_\epsilon((a_1, \dots, a_n) - (b_1, \dots, b_m)) \\
&= \epsilon \log\left(\sum_{i=1}^n e^{\overline{a_i}/\epsilon}\right) - \epsilon \log\left(\sum_{j=1}^m e^{\overline{b_j}/\epsilon}\right) \\
&= \epsilon \log\left(\sum_{i=1}^p e^{\overline{a'_i}/\epsilon}\right) - \epsilon \log\left(\sum_{j=1}^q e^{\overline{b'_j}/\epsilon}\right) + \epsilon \log\left(\sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^q e^{\overline{a_i + b'_j}/\epsilon}\right) - \epsilon \log\left(\sum_{i=1}^p \sum_{j=1}^m e^{\overline{a'_i + b_j}/\epsilon}\right) \\
&= \epsilon \log\left(\sum_{i=1}^p e^{\overline{a'_i}/\epsilon}\right) - \epsilon \log\left(\sum_{j=1}^q e^{\overline{b'_j}/\epsilon}\right) \\
&= R_\epsilon((a'_1, \dots, a'_p) - (b'_1, \dots, b'_q)),
\end{aligned}$$

which shows the invariance under relation (2.10). Here, we have used (3.2) in the third line. $\square$

For any positive real number ϵ , define a map $\text{Max}_\epsilon : \mathbf{C} \times \mathbf{C} \rightarrow \mathbf{C}$ by

$$\text{Max}_\epsilon(a, b) = \epsilon \log(e^{a/\epsilon} + e^{b/\epsilon}),$$

where $a, b \in \mathbf{C}$. Here, we remark that $\mathbf{C}$ with Max_ϵ has the Max-Plus algebra structures (1.1), (1.2) and (1.3).

Theorem 3.4 (1) The map $R_\epsilon : \Phi \rightarrow \mathbf{C}$ is a representation of Φ . More precisely, for $\alpha, \alpha' \in \Phi$, we have

$$R_\epsilon(\text{Max}(\alpha, \alpha')) = \text{Max}_\epsilon(R_\epsilon(\alpha), R_\epsilon(\alpha')), \quad (3.3)$$

$$R_\epsilon(\alpha + \alpha') = R_\epsilon(\alpha) + R_\epsilon(\alpha'), \quad (3.4)$$

$$R_\epsilon(\alpha - \alpha') = R_\epsilon(\alpha) - R_\epsilon(\alpha'). \quad (3.5)$$

(2) If $R_\epsilon(\alpha) = 0$ for any ϵ , then $\alpha = 0$.

Proof. (1) Firstly, we will prove (3.3) as follows. For $\alpha = \mathbf{a} - \mathbf{b} = (a_1, \dots, a_n) - (b_1, \dots, b_m) \in \Phi$ and $\alpha' = \mathbf{a}' - \mathbf{b}' = (a'_1, \dots, a'_p) - (b'_1, \dots, b'_q) \in \Phi$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} R_\epsilon(\text{Max}(\alpha, \alpha')) &= R_\epsilon(\overline{\text{Max}}(\mathbf{a} + \mathbf{b}', \mathbf{a}' + \mathbf{b}) - (\mathbf{b} + \mathbf{b}')) \\ &= R_\epsilon\left(\left((a_i + b'_j)_{i=1, j=1}^n, (a'_k + b_l)_{k=1, l=1}^p\right) - (b_i + b'_j)_{i=1, j=1}^m, q\right) \\ &= \epsilon \log\left(\sum_{i,j} e^{\overline{a_i + b'_j}/\epsilon} + \sum_{i,j} e^{\overline{a'_i + b_j}/\epsilon}\right) - \epsilon \log\left(\sum_{i,j} e^{\overline{b_i + b'_j}/\epsilon}\right) \\ &= \epsilon \log\left(\frac{\sum_i e^{\overline{a_i}/\epsilon}}{\sum_i e^{\overline{b_i}/\epsilon}} + \frac{\sum_i e^{\overline{a'_i}/\epsilon}}{\sum_i e^{\overline{b'_i}/\epsilon}}\right) \\ &= \text{Max}_\epsilon\left(\epsilon \log\left(\frac{\sum_i e^{\overline{a_i}/\epsilon}}{\sum_i e^{\overline{b_i}/\epsilon}}\right), \epsilon \log\left(\frac{\sum_i e^{\overline{a'_i}/\epsilon}}{\sum_i e^{\overline{b'_i}/\epsilon}}\right)\right) \\ &= \text{Max}_\epsilon\left(\epsilon \log\left(\sum_i e^{\overline{a_i}/\epsilon}\right) - \epsilon \log\left(\sum_i e^{\overline{b_i}/\epsilon}\right), \epsilon \log\left(\sum_i e^{\overline{a'_i}/\epsilon}\right) - \epsilon \log\left(\sum_i e^{\overline{b'_i}/\epsilon}\right)\right) \\ &= \text{Max}_\epsilon(R_\epsilon(\alpha), R_\epsilon(\alpha')), \end{aligned}$$

which shows (3.3). Secondly, we will prove (3.4) as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} R_\epsilon(\text{Max}(\alpha + \alpha')) &= R_\epsilon((\mathbf{a} + \mathbf{a}') - (\mathbf{b} + \mathbf{b}')) \\ &= R_\epsilon\left(\left((a_i + a'_j)_{i=1, j=1}^n, p\right) - (b_i + b'_j)_{i=1, j=1}^m, q\right) \\ &= \epsilon \log\left(\sum_{i,j} e^{\overline{a_i + a'_j}/\epsilon}\right) - \epsilon \log\left(\sum_{i,j} e^{\overline{b_i + b'_j}/\epsilon}\right) \\ &= \epsilon \log\left(\sum_i e^{\overline{a_i}/\epsilon}\right) - \epsilon \log\left(\sum_i e^{\overline{b_i}/\epsilon}\right) + \epsilon \log\left(\sum_i e^{\overline{a'_i}/\epsilon}\right) - \epsilon \log\left(\sum_i e^{\overline{b'_i}/\epsilon}\right) \\ &= R_\epsilon\left(\left((a_i)_{i=1}^n - (b_i)_{i=1}^m\right) + R_\epsilon\left(\left((a'_i)_{i=1}^n - (b'_i)_{i=1}^q\right)\right) \\ &= R_\epsilon(\alpha) + R_\epsilon(\alpha'). \end{aligned}$$

This shows (3.4). We can obtain (3.5) in the same way.

(2) For $\alpha = (a_1, \dots, a_n) - (b_1, \dots, b_m) \in \Phi$, it is assumed that α is irreducible and $a_1 \geq \dots \geq a_n$ and $b_1 \geq \dots \geq b_m$. Then, we have

$$\begin{aligned} R_\epsilon(\alpha) &= \epsilon \log(e^{\overline{a_1}/\epsilon} + \dots + e^{\overline{a_n}/\epsilon}) - \epsilon \log(e^{\overline{b_1}/\epsilon} + \dots + e^{\overline{b_m}/\epsilon}) \\ &= 0. \end{aligned}$$

Hence, we have

$$e^{\overline{a_1}/\epsilon} + \dots + e^{\overline{a_n}/\epsilon} = e^{\overline{b_1}/\epsilon} + \dots + e^{\overline{b_m}/\epsilon}.$$

This equation is equal to

$$e^{\overline{a_1}/\epsilon}(1 + e^{-\overline{(a_1-a_2)}/\epsilon} + \dots + e^{-\overline{(a_1-a_n)}/\epsilon}) = e^{\overline{b_1}/\epsilon}(1 + e^{-\overline{(b_1-b_2)}/\epsilon} + \dots + e^{-\overline{(b_1-b_m)}/\epsilon}).$$

Considering $\epsilon \rightarrow \infty$, we have $a_1 = b_1$. By using inductive argument, we obtain

$$(a_1, \dots, a_n) = (b_1, \dots, b_m),$$

which shows $\alpha = 0$. $\square$

3.3. The ultra-discrete recursive equation

Define $UD : \mathbf{Z} \rightarrow \Omega$ by

$$UD(n) = \begin{cases} 0 + \underbrace{[0, \dots, 0]}_{k-1}, & \text{if } n = k, \\ -\infty & \text{if } n = 0, \\ \eta + \underbrace{[0, \dots, 0]}_{k-1} & \text{if } n = -k. \end{cases}$$

Let $P : \mathbf{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$ be a polynomial function of finite degree given by

$$P(x_1, \dots, x_n) = \sum_{i_1, \dots, i_n=1}^N a_{i_1 \dots i_n} x_1^{i_1} \dots x_n^{i_n},$$

where $a_{i_1 \dots i_n} \in \mathbf{Z}$, $x_i \in \mathbf{R}$. For $P(x_1, \dots, x_n)$, define its UD polynomial $P_{UD} : \Omega^n \rightarrow \Omega$ by

$$P_{UD}(X_1, \dots, X_n) = \max_{i_1, \dots, i_n=1}^N \left(UD(a_{i_1 \dots i_n}) + i_1 X_1 + \dots + i_n X_n \right),$$

where $X_i \in \Omega$.

More generally, let $F : \mathbf{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$ a rational function given by

$$F(x_1, \dots, x_n) = \frac{P(x_n, \dots, x_1)}{Q(x_n, \dots, x_1)},$$

where P and Q are polynomial functions of finite degree. Then, we define its UD equation $F_{UD} : \Omega^n \rightarrow \Omega$ by

$$F_{UD}(X_1, \dots, X_n) = P_{UD}(X_1, \dots, X_n) - Q_{UD}(X_1, \dots, X_n). \quad (3.6)$$

Remark. (3.6) is just obtained by the following transformations:

$$\begin{aligned} x_i \times y_j &\longrightarrow X_i + Y_j, \\ x_i / y_j &\longrightarrow X_i - Y_j, \\ x_i + y_j &\longrightarrow \text{Max}(X_i, Y_j), \\ x_i - y_j &\longrightarrow \text{Max}(X_i, Y_j + \eta), \\ a_{i_1 \dots i_n} &\longrightarrow \text{UD}(a_{i_1 \dots i_n}). \end{aligned}$$

Theorem 3.5 Suppose a periodic recursive equation

$$x_{n+1} = F(x_1, \dots, x_n) = \frac{P(x_n, \dots, x_1)}{Q(x_n, \dots, x_1)} \quad (3.7)$$

on $\mathbf{R}$ has period k (i.e. $x_{n+k} = x_n$), then its UD periodic recursive equation

$$X_{n+1} = F_{UD}(X_1, \dots, X_n) = P_{UD}(X_1, \dots, X_n) - Q_{UD}(X_1, \dots, X_n)$$

on Ω also has period k (i.e. $X_{n+k} = X_n$).

Proof. Substituting $x_n = e^{R_\epsilon(X_n)/\epsilon}$ into (3.7), we have

$$\begin{aligned} e^{R_\epsilon(X_{n+1})/\epsilon} &= \frac{P(e^{R_\epsilon(X_n)/\epsilon}, \dots, e^{R_\epsilon(X_1)/\epsilon})}{Q(e^{R_\epsilon(X_n)/\epsilon}, \dots, e^{R_\epsilon(X_1)/\epsilon})} \\ &= \frac{\sum_{i_1, \dots, i_n=1}^N a_{i_1 \dots i_n} e^{(i_1 R_\epsilon(X_1) + \dots + i_n R_\epsilon(X_n))/\epsilon}}{\sum_{i_1, \dots, i_n=1}^N b_{i_1 \dots i_n} e^{(i_1 R_\epsilon(X_1) + \dots + i_n R_\epsilon(X_n))/\epsilon}} \\ &= \frac{\sum_{i_1, \dots, i_n=1}^N e^{(\epsilon \log a_{i_1 \dots i_n} + R_\epsilon(i_1 X_1 + \dots + i_n X_n))/\epsilon}}{\sum_{i_1, \dots, i_n=1}^N e^{(\epsilon \log b_{i_1 \dots i_n} + R_\epsilon(i_1 X_1 + \dots + i_n X_n))/\epsilon}} \\ &= \frac{\sum_{i_1, \dots, i_n=1}^N e^{R_\epsilon(U(a_{i_1 \dots i_n}) + i_1 X_1 + \dots + i_n X_n)/\epsilon}}{\sum_{i_1, \dots, i_n=1}^N e^{R_\epsilon(U(b_{i_1 \dots i_n}) + i_1 X_1 + \dots + i_n X_n)/\epsilon}}. \end{aligned}$$

Here, in the last line, we have used

$$\begin{aligned}
\epsilon \log a_{i_1 \dots i_n} &= \epsilon \log \underbrace{e^{0/\epsilon} + \dots + e^{0/\epsilon}}_{a_{i_1 \dots i_n}} \\
&= R_\epsilon(\underbrace{(0, \dots, 0)}_{a_{i_1 \dots i_n}}) \\
&= R_\epsilon(0 + \underbrace{[0, \dots, 0]}_{a_{i_1 \dots i_n} - 1}) \\
&= R_\epsilon(U(a_{i_1 \dots i_n})).
\end{aligned}$$

Then, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&R_\epsilon(X_{n+1}) \\
&= \text{Max}_{i_1, \dots, i_n=1}^N (R_\epsilon(U(a_{i_1 \dots i_n}) + i_1 X_1 + \dots + i_n X_n)) - \text{Max}_{i_1, \dots, i_n=1}^N (R_\epsilon(U(b_{i_1 \dots i_n}) + i_1 X_1 + \dots + i_n X_n)) \\
&= R_\epsilon\left(\text{Max}_{i_1, \dots, i_n=1}^N (U(a_{i_1 \dots i_n}) + i_1 X_1 + \dots + i_n X_n) - \text{Max}_{i_1, \dots, i_n=1}^N (U(b_{i_1 \dots i_n}) + i_1 X_1 + \dots + i_n X_n)\right).
\end{aligned}$$

Hence, we finally obtain

$$R_\epsilon(X_{n+1}) = R_\epsilon(P_{UD}(X_1, \dots, X_n) - Q_{UD}(X_1, \dots, X_n)).$$

On the other hand, we have $R_\epsilon(X_{n+k}) = R_\epsilon(X_n)$ from $x_{n+k} = x_n$. This implies $X_{n+k} = X_n$. $\square$

Next, we will give some examples.

Example 3.6 The periodic recursive equation

$$x_{n+1} = \frac{x_n}{x_{n-1}}$$

has period 5. Then, from Theorem 3.5, we find that its UD equation

$$X_{n+1} = \text{Max}(X_n, 0) - X_{n-1} \tag{3.8}$$

also has period 5. For example, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
X_1 &= 1, \quad X_2 = 5, \quad X_3 = 4 + [5], \quad X_4 = -1 + [4, 5], \\
X_5 &= -4 + [1, 5, 6] - [5], \quad X_6 = 1, \quad X_7 = 5.
\end{aligned} \tag{3.9}$$

Remark. If $X_i \in \Omega_0$ for all i , then we can act the projection map $P : \Omega_0 \rightarrow \mathbf{Z}$ for both sides of equation (3.8). Then, we have

$$Y_{n+1} = \max(Y_n, 0) - Y_{n-1},$$

where $Y_i = P(X_i)$. This equation also has period 5. For example,

$$\begin{aligned} Y_1 &= 1, & Y_2 &= 5, & Y_3 &= 4, & Y_4 &= -1, \\ Y_5 &= -4, & Y_6 &= 1, & Y_7 &= 5, \end{aligned}$$

which correspond to (3.9).

Example 3.7 The periodic recursive equation

$$x_{n+1} = \frac{x_n - 1}{x_n + 1}$$

has period 4. Then, from Theorem 3.5, we find that its UD equation

$$X_{n+1} = \text{Max}(X_n, \eta) - \text{Max}(X_n, 0) \quad (3.10)$$

also has period 4. For example,

$$\begin{aligned} X_1 &= 2, & X_2 &= [2 + \eta] - [2], & X_3 &= -2 + \eta, \\ X_4 &= \eta + [2] - [2 + \eta], & X_5 &= 2. \end{aligned} \quad (3.11)$$

Remark. We cannot act the projection map $P : \Omega_0 \rightarrow \mathbf{Z}$ for both sides of equation (3.10) and (3.11), since all the variables X_i do not belong to Ω_0 . Therefore, this is a new type of UD equations, which cannot be obtained by the usual ultra-discretization procedure.

References

- [1] R. Hirota, K. Kimura and H. Yahagi: How to find the conserved quantities of nonlinear discrete equations, J. Phys. A **34** (2001) 10377-10386.
- [2] R. Hirota, S. Tsujimoto: Conserved Quantities of a Class of Nonlinear Difference-Difference Equations, J. Phys. Soc. Jpn. **64** (1995) 3125-3127.
- [3] D. Takahashi and J. Satsuma: A Soliton Cellular Automaton, J. Phys.Soc. Jpn. **59** (1990) 3514-3519.
- [4] D. Takahashi, T. Tokihiro, B.Grammaticos, Y. Ohta, A Ramani: Constructing Solutions to the Ultra-Discrete Painleve Equations, J. Phys. A **30** (1997) 7953-7966.
- [5] T. Tokihiro, A. Nagai and J. Satsuma: Proof of solitonical nature of box and ball system by Means of Inverse Ultra-Discretization, Inverse Problems **15** (1999) 1639-1662.

- [6] T. Tokihiro, D. Takahashi, J. Matsukidaira: Box and Ball system as a realization of ultra-discrete nonautonomous KP equation, J. Phys. A **33** (2000) 607-619.
- [7] T. Tokihiro, D. Takahashi, J. Matsukidaira and J. Satsuma: From Soliton Equations to Integrable Cellular Automata through a Limiting Procedure, Phys. Rev. Lett. **76** (1996) 3247-3250.
- [8] M. Torii, D. Takahashi and J. Satsuma: Combinatorial Representation of Invariants of Soliton Cellular Automaton, Physica D **92** (1996) 209-220.
- [9] G. Hatayama, K. Hikami, R. Inoue, A. Kuniba, T. Takagi and T. Tokihiro: The $A_M^{(1)}$ automata related to crystals of symmetric tensors, J. Math. Phys. **42** (2001) 274-308.
- [10] G. Hatayama, A. Kuniba and T. Takagi: Simple Algorithm for Factorized Dynamics of g_n -Automaton, J. Phys. A **34** (2001) 10697-10705.